

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, and 15-17 have been amended, claims 5-6 and 13-14 have been cancelled, without prejudice, and new claims 18-21 have been added. Thus, claims 1-4, 7-12, and 15-21 remain pending in the application.

Amendments and New Claims

Support for the amendments and new claims can be found in the previous claims and on page 5, lines 1-6, and page 11, line 22, through page 12, line 14 of the present application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-17 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,763,095 to *Cermak et al.* (hereinafter "Cermak") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

As amended, claim 1 recites a method comprising:

"receiving, by a wireless mobile communication device, a first user request from an input key of the wireless mobile communication device;

in response, displaying by the wireless mobile communication device, on a display of the wireless mobile communication device, a list of communication messages of at least two message types, at least one of the two message types selected from a message type group consisting of an email message type, a text message type, a voice message type, and a call message type;

first facilitating, by the wireless mobile communication device, selection, from the displayed list of communication messages, one communication message of the displayed list; and

in response to a selection of the first facilitating, second facilitating by the wireless mobile communication device, reply to the selected communication message, with the second facilitating including

- (1) automatically selecting a first communication protocol associated with the selected communication message to enable reply to the selected message using the first communication protocol, or
- (2) rendering a menu of communication protocols to enable selection of a second communication protocol for replying to the selected communication message using the second communication protocol."

In contrast, Cermak simply teaches a system for identifying callers and message senders to a called messaged/party. In one variation, Cermak discloses displaying the messages, such as call messages, IM messages, voicemail messages, and email messages, in a unified messaging mailbox. While Cermak does mention the ability of a user to select one of the displayed messages and to open or delete the message, and generally discusses the ability of the user to reply to received messages, nothing in Cermak mentions facilitating a user in selecting one of the displayed messages, and, in response, facilitating a user in replying to the message, either in the message's associated communication protocol (e.g., phone call), or in another communication protocol (e.g., email). Further, Cermak does not disclose the displaying/rendering of a menu of communication protocol reply options in response to the selection of a displayed message, as is claimed in claim 1.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Cermak under 35 USC §102(e).

Amended claim 9 recites limitations similar to those of amended claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claim 9 is not anticipated by Cermak.

Claims 2-4, 7-8, 10-12, and 15-17 depend from claims 1 and 9, incorporating their limitations respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-4, 7-8, 10-12, and 15-17 are not anticipated by Cermak.

Additionally, Cermak does not disclose, expressly or inherently, the display of pictorial icons associated with the callers/message senders, as is claimed in claims 2 and 10, or the display of pictorial icons indicating that the caller/message sender is an unknown caller/message sender, as is claimed in claims 3 and 11. Cermak mentions displaying identification information about the caller/messenger sender, but does not teach or suggest the use of icons to do so. In fact, Cermak teaches away from their use, as the very purpose of Cermak is to provide the called/messaged party with as much information as possible about the caller/message sender.

Lastly, new claims 19 and 21, which are not rejected, recite the display/rendering of a message outbox having outgoing messages of different types. No such outbox is discussed or contemplated by Cermak.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 7-11, and 15-21 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 7-12, and 15-21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: October 27, 2006

by: /Robert C. Peck/

Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981